

"Southampton—codel requests be met at Queen Mary Cherbourg with \$100 U.S. equivalent in local currencies for each member party."

This meant that the busy U.S. Embassy in Paris had to send a man to Cherbourg, requiring a day round trip, just so the Congressman from Harlem and his two secretaries would have \$300 worth of French francs to spend immediately after they got off the boat. The average tourist steps up to the money change office and gets his money exchanged in 5 minutes. He doesn't have a representative from the American Embassy in Paris spend a whole day providing him with francs.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 6, 1962]

POWELL'S SHAMELESS JUNKET

In the midst of the important closing period of the congressional session, when a record of accomplishment versus do-nothingism is in the balance, the chairman of a major committee of the House is traveling about Europe on a frivolous junket. Almost needless to say, this is ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, chairman of the Education and Labor Committee, a Democrat from Harlem who annually vies with BUCKLEY of the Bronx for the dishonor of being among the most absent Members of Congress.

Representative POWELL sailed for Europe August 8 with Mrs. Tamara J. Wall, associate labor counsel for the committee, and Miss Corrine Huff, receptionist in his office. They are due back about September 21. Mr. POWELL is supposedly conducting an inquiry into equal opportunities for women in Europe, a study that will take him to a Paris nightclub show, a Venice film festival, and possibly on an Aegean cruise. State Department officials have been alerted to arrange hospitality and entertainment, as well as counterpart funds—other countries' reimbursement for our foreign aid—which conveniently need not be accounted for in detail by our traveling Congressmen. Mr. POWELL is not alone in the enjoyment of this and other abuses of the congressional privilege.

The reckless, irresponsible conduct of Mr. POWELL is a disgrace to the people of his district, to the U.S. Congress and to the Kennedy administration, which to its discredit sent Secretaries Ribicoff and Goldberg to New York last year to attend a Powell glorification dinner.

We say it is time for the people of Harlem to wake up, quit making a hero out of this man who holds in such contempt his obligations in public office, and retire him from Congress before he has a chance to make good on his repeated promises to retire himself. As for the House of Representatives and the Kennedy administration, have they no discipline for a Member, and especially a committee chairman, who runs away to Europe for 6 weeks on idle whimsy like this "inquiry" just at a time when Congress is (belatedly) trying to get down to serious business.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, how much time have we remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 1 hour and 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. How much time does the Senator from New York desire?

Mr. KEATING. I should like 25 minutes. I do not wish to interfere with any Senator who desires to speak on the tax bill, because that will not be the subject of my remarks.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I know no substitute

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield 25 minutes to the Senator from New York.

BUILDDUP IN CUBA

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, for the last few days we have all been absorbed in the latest, the most up-to-date details of Soviet military expansion on the island of Cuba. Members of Congress including myself have made available to the American people detailed reports of day to day ship movements, vehicle alignments, and personnel maneuvering in and around Cuba with the object of making clear to the American people the fact that the last month has seen a tremendous increase in the Soviet commitment to Cuba and in the Communist forces now deployed on the island.

It has now been revealed that 64 ships with materiel and troops have arrived in Cuba—a fact, which has been somewhat played down, even by those of us who knew the facts. A much smaller number of ships has been referred to up to this point.

One of the results of the increased public discussion and interest in the Cuban situation—and to date it has been the only significant development on the part of our Government—but a very constructive one—is an official announcement from the President admitting for the first time that the Cubans possess missiles, extensive radar and electronic equipment, torpedo boats and guided missiles, and at least 3,500 so-called military technicians.

I do not intend to belabor the significance of the word "technicians," but anyone who has seen a modern American Army or Air Force recruitment poster knows that the military men in modern service are no longer GI Joes of what was called in World War I the flatfoot variety. They are very definitely technicians, with a knowledge and ability to operate complicated weapons and weapons systems. In fact, the promise of being trained as a "technician" is one of the most effective incentives for enlistment. I am sure the Soviet Army also has its share of such technicians.

I refer to a statement in a news item published in today's issue of the Washington Post, which is undoubtedly typical of the reaction of someone in the Department of State. No one in the military forces could possibly have made such a statement. It is the reaction of those who wish to play down the situation, and who feel that those of us who believe that the American people should be alerted are unduly concerned. I read the statement of the official, without designating him. He said:

"There is little meaning in statements like those of Senator Keating that the Soviet technicians are in reality soldiers. Not only is there no evidence of this, the source said, but 3,500 common foot soldiers would probably pose less danger to hemispheric security than 3,500 trained technicians."

The clear implication of that article is that the Senator from New York has

said there are 3,500 foot soldiers in Cuba. Of course, I have never made any such assumption or statement. Such is not the fact, and I entirely agree that technicians of that kind pose a much greater threat to the security of the United States than do foot soldiers.

There are no foot soldiers, so far as I know, in Cuba. The soldiers who are there are what would be called in our Army, for the most part, Signal Corps personnel, labor battalions. They are under military discipline, they are under military orders, they move in military formation, they are dressed in uniforms, and they are what in American parlance are called soldiers. However, I am willing to accept the phrase "military technicians."

Mr. President, I am much more deeply concerned with the subtle shift in U.S. policy toward Cuba. Our Government describes the buildup in Cuba as a defensive rather than as an offensive capability. Whether a gun is offensive or defensive depends entirely on the man who holds the gun. Mig airplanes, tanks, halftracks, or missiles can be used in defense, it is true, but likewise they can also be used in offense, and whether they are defensive or offensive depends entirely on the intentions of the operator.

Furthermore, it is a little hard to understand what defensive purpose amphibious vehicles would have. It was said by the Senator from California [Mr. ENGEL] last night that the remarks of the Senator from New York, which were made on two occasions in considerable detail, were wrong because he had said there were amphibious vehicles in Cuba. What the Senator from New York has said was that amphibious vehicles had been observed in Cuba. I repeat the statement.

However, it is quite interesting that the distinguished Senator from California, who had indicated that there would be an effort made to show the inaccuracy of the remarks of the Senator from New York, pointed out nothing except this one sentence in the entire remarks of the Senator from New York.

That the facts given to the Senate on last Friday and on last Tuesday were accurate to the extent of 97 or 98 percent has been more than confirmed by subsequent disclosures.

Apparently the attitude of our Government is that we have no objection and that we raise no protest if these weapons which are in Cuba are directed only against the Cuban people; that it has ceased to be aggression in our vocabulary when Soviet-Russian technicians and equipment are brought to Cuba to force their will upon the people of Cuba. The President referred only very briefly to "the unhappy people of Cuba." It is apparently of no concern to us that they are threatened by the so-called defensive weapons; that their homeland is put under the control of Communists from Moscow; that their children are sent to Russia for education; that their best brains and most capable workers are fleeing in droves from the tyranny that Castro and Khrushchev have established in Cuba. All this, we are now told, is not true, and the reason many banks of well-established and well-known American

the concern of the people of the United States.

We have been told that this buildup in Cuba is permissible unless an overt offensive attack is made from Cuba upon some other country in this hemisphere; that the Cuban question is no longer to be considered on its own merits but "as a part of the worldwide challenge posed by the Communist threat to the peace."

The background, the geography, the entire basis of the Communist enslavement of Cuba is to be ignored, as in effect we seem to be prepared to accept the status quo of Cuba, whatever it may be.

Mr. President, this approach represents a serious shift of U.S. policy, a complete reinterpretation of the Monroe Doctrine, and even more sharply a repudiation of the policies which the people of this country supported last year and the year before.

There has been a lot of talk as to what the Monroe Doctrine really means. Under the interpretations which have been forced upon it in the last few months, there is indeed very little meaning left in the doctrine. But if we can look briefly to President Monroe's own words in his seventh annual message of December 2, 1823, the essential meaning—and commonsense behind the Monroe Doctrine is perfectly clear. If we will substitute in our minds the words "Communist powers" where President Monroe spoke of "allied powers," the reasonableness and significance of President Monroe's words will be just as apparent today as when they were first enunciated.

I wish to recite briefly the pertinent part of the Monroe Doctrine. Said President Monroe:

The political system of the allied powers is essentially different in this respect from that of America. This difference proceeds from that which exists in their respective Governments; and to the defense of our own, which has been achieved by the loss of so much blood and treasure, and matured by the wisdom of their most enlightened citizens, and under which we have enjoyed unexampled felicity, this whole Nation is devoted. We owe it, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered and shall not interfere. But with the Governments who have declared their independence and maintained it, and whose independence we have, on great consideration and on just principles, acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States. It is impossible that the allied powers should extend their political system to any portion of either continent without endangering our peace and happiness; nor can anyone believe that our southern brethren, if left to themselves, would adopt it of their own accord. It is equally impossible, therefore, that we should behold such interposition in any form, with indifference.

This is the substance and the core and the meaning of the Monroe Doctrine.

There is no doubt in my mind that President Monroe would clearly have considered the present situation in Cuba a direct threat against which the Monroe Doctrine should be enforced. Indeed, as late as June 1960 the previous administration affirmed these principles. The Department of State issued a press release dated July 14, 1960, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMATHERS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. KEATING. I shall not read it all, but, prior to the issuance of the press release Mr. Khrushchev, on July 12, 1960, had said that the Monroe Doctrine has outlived its time, has died a natural death.

Khrushchev further said that the Monroe Doctrine allowed the United States to perpetuate the reign of colonialism and monopoly in Latin America. He said:

Should the United States take aggressive action against the Cuban people upholding their national independence, we would support the Cuban people.

Then he characterized—and, Mr. President, how significant this is—as "silly fabrications" reports that the U.S.S.R. wanted a military base in Cuba.

He said:

It is a silly fabrication because all we need to do is use our reliable rockets from the U.S.S.R. that can hit any target in the world.

Following that, the Department of State, on July 14, 1960, issued a press release in which it said:

In the first place, the principles of the Monroe Doctrine are as valid today as they were in 1823 when the doctrine was proclaimed. Furthermore, the Monroe Doctrine's purpose of preventing any extension to this hemisphere of a despotic political system contrary to the independent status of the American States is supported by the inter-American security system through the Organization of American States. Specifically, the Organization of American States Charter and the Rio Treaty provide the means for common action to protect the hemisphere against the interventionist and aggressive designs of international communism.

Then, skipping a part of the statement, which will be printed in its entirety in the RECORD, the State Department official said, on July 14, 1960:

One of the principal purposes of the Rio Treaty was to provide a method for dealing with threats of imperialistic powers seeking to establish their domination in the Western Hemisphere.

Then, further in the statement, we read:

The principles which the U.S. Government enunciated in the face of the attempts of the old imperialism to intervene in the affairs of this hemisphere are as valid today for the attempts of the new imperialism. It consequently reaffirms with vigor the principles expressed by President Monroe.

"We owe it *** to candor *** to declare that we should consider any attempt on their [European powers] part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety, and for that reason, we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety."

The press release concluded:

Today, nearly a century and a half later, the United States is gratified that these principles are not professed by itself alone, but represent through solemn agreements the views of the American community as a whole.

Those were the official views of the Department of State as expressed on July 14, 1960.

Oh, Mr. President, how far from those views we have come in the month of September 1962.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Burdick in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. I have not been privileged to hear all that the able Senator from New York has been saying in respect to the present situation. I merely wondered whether he has any specific recommendations as to what the U.S. Government should do today. What is it that the Senator from New York would have our Government do?

Mr. KEATING. I have already made a number of recommendations. I intend to cover them again in my remarks, not simply to reiterate them. I have made four specific recommendations.

If the Senator from Florida is willing, I should prefer to proceed with my speech, because I fear that I will be confronted with a time limitation element which will cut me off. I realize that I am transgressing on another debate.

Mr. SMATHERS. I appreciate the Senator's situation. I merely wondered if the Senator was going so far at this moment as to suggest that U.S. troops be used to storm the shores of Cuba.

Mr. KEATING. I am not, and I never have. The statement by the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] on a television program yesterday morning, in which he may have created the impression that I had done so, is completely away from the fact. I do not advocate, I do not favor at this time, an invasion of Cuba by American forces.

Mr. SMATHERS. I wondered, then, if the Senator from New York had some intermediate recommendations or steps.

Mr. KEATING. I have made four recommendations.

Mr. SMATHERS. As the Senator from New York knows, we have discussed this subject on the floor of the Senate on previous occasions. The junior Senator from Florida has suggested two intermediate steps which he has long felt should be taken. Would the Senator from New York agree that the time has just about arrived, or even is long since overdue, for that matter, when we should go about the business of creating a NATO type organization for the Western Hemisphere comprising those nations which are like minded with us, and which, at some future date, if and when necessary, would have the military authority to protect, not necessarily the United States, but some Central American country, and second, in time to come, to recognize a government in exile, so that

through the government in exile not only equipment but, in some instances, funds could be sent through it to the nationals of such a country which is fighting for its freedom, and to those who want to fight for its freedom from outside the country.

Mr. KEATING. I am aware of the firm, solid position of the Senator from Florida on this issue. I would support, and support enthusiastically, the suggestions which he has made. The ones I have made are somewhat different; but I know that his are constructive, helpful suggestions, and I would enthusiastically endorse them.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. KEATING. I will yield, although I wish to complete my address within the time allotted to me.

Mr. BUSH. The Senator from New York has raised a very important question. I should like to make a comment and ask the Senator's opinion, especially in response to what the Senator from Florida has said. It will not take more than 2 minutes.

Mr. KEATING. I am happy to yield.

Mr. BUSH. First, in January 1960 and again in January 1961, I submitted Senate Concurrent Resolution 5. Without reading the whereas clauses, I shall read the resolving clause, which is brief:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That (a) if one or more of the high contracting parties to the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance should be threatened in any manner with domination, control, or colonization through the intervention of the world Communist movement, any other such party would be justified, in the exercise of individual or collective self-defense under article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, in taking appropriate steps to forestall such intervention and any domination, control, or colonization of any nation of the Western Hemisphere by the world Communist movement.

(b) If any such defensive measures are taken by any defending nation of the Western Hemisphere, such nation should report promptly the action so taken to the Inter-American Organ of Consultation, to the end that an emergency committee, established in the manner provided by the Convention of Havana of 1940, may be organized to provide for the provisional administration of the nation so defended, pending its restoration to a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

Would not such action by Congress strengthen the hand of the President of the United States at this time?

Mr. KEATING. I sincerely hope that Congress will take some action expressing its sense on this subject. I feel certain that it would strengthen the hand of the President.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD following the remarks of the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, President Kennedy, in October 1960, before his election, made a clear and forthright statement, just as clear and forthright as the statement issued by the Depart-

ment of State in July 1960 about our policy toward Cuba. He said:

We must let Mr. Khrushchev know that we are permitting no expansion of his foothold in our hemisphere—and that the OAS will be given real strength and stature to resist any further Communist penetration, by whatever means necessary.

That was said nearly 2 years ago, before Mr. Khrushchev expanded his foothold by sending missiles, technicians, torpedo boats, and other military equipment to Cuba. Yet we have done nothing.

Even more recently, in April of 1961, the President declared:

Let the record show that our restraint is not inexhaustible. Should it ever appear that the Inter-American doctrine of non-interference merely conceals or excuses a policy of nonaction—if the nations of this hemisphere should fail to meet their commitments against outside Communist penetration—then I want it clearly understood that this Government will not hesitate in meeting its primary obligations which are to the security of our own Nation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). The time yielded to the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I shall need 20 minutes more.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I do not have quite that much time to yield. I yield the Senator from New York 10 minutes, and then we shall see what can be arranged after that.

Mr. KEATING. Very well.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I should like to have 10 minutes, if the Senator from Delaware will reserve it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, at this time I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from New York, and then we shall see if that much time will suffice.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for an additional 10 minutes.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. President, we do not intend to abandon Cuba, the President assured the people of the Western Hemisphere on that day. But significantly enough, in the same statement, the President said—and these are the especially pertinent words:

Too long we have fixed our eyes on traditional military needs, on armies prepared to cross borders or missiles poised for flight. Now it should be clear that this is no longer enough, that our security may be lost without the firing of a single missile or the crossing of a single border.

Mr. President, I think the best comment on and the best answer to President Kennedy's statement on Soviet aid to Cuba must be given in his own words. We can no longer afford to think only of organized combat forces, of military bases, of violations of the 1934 treaty, or of offensive ground-to-ground missiles, for as the President himself so very effectively pointed out barely a year ago:

Our security may be lost without the firing of a single missile or the crossing of a single border.

Mr. President, it is my contention that a very substantial measure of our security has already been lost by the heavy Russian buildup in Cuba over the last months. First and foremost, the entire world has learned that American words are not necessarily going to be followed by American action; that what we say one day, we may very conveniently want to forget the next day; that the Communists can continue, step by step, to push us against the wall, where vital security interests are concerned, and that we will yield gracefully, as we have done in Laos already, and as we are now doing in Cuba. Once again, let me quote the words of the President, last April, when he said:

The message of Cuba, of Laos, of the rising din of Communist voices in Asia and Latin America—these messages are all the same. The complacent, self-indulgent, the soft society, are being swept away with the debris of history. Only the strong, only the industrious, only the visionary can survive.

Mr. President, I sincerely hope that Cuba is not going to be handled in the same manner as Laos, and that the message which the world will again receive from the United States will not be retreat and defeat.

Second, Mr. President, a substantial measure of American security has already been lost because of the strategic proximity of Cuba to our major missile launching site, Cape Canaveral. I pointed out last Friday that it is entirely within the present electronic capabilities of the Soviet Union to devise methods of overhearing and eventually interfering with American missile launchings at the cape. I am reliably informed—and I have checked this out with a number of experts, both in and out of the Government, and all of them agree—that the Communists undoubtedly can construct the equipment necessary to eavesdrop on our radio control system and eventually to interfere with it in a number of different ways. As a result, rockets may find themselves off course, astronaut launchings may be endangered, and the security as well as timing of our entire space effort may be dangerously handicapped.

Any such operations by the Soviet Union would be very costly; but we know that the Soviets are today spending more money to jam the Voice of America than we spend on the entire U.S. Information Agency. Surely, it would be equally worthwhile for the Russians to take the necessary steps, which are clearly within their capabilities, to jam American space efforts.

Last evening the distinguished junior Senator from California asserted more than once that the President has withheld nothing from the American people, and that this administration has given the full facts.

First, let me say that never has it crossed my lips at any time that the President or any administration official has given the American people an untruth. What I have said is that the full facts have not been given. I am very glad the President spoke out Tuesday night, and I commend him for it. But I have not yet heard the President make

any statement with regard to the present strategic vulnerability of Cape Canaveral. To my knowledge, the President has never informed the American people that Cape Canaveral is secure from this type of interference. The President very significantly, in my judgment, omitted any reference to the danger which a virtual Soviet occupation of Cuba creates for Cape Canaveral. To my mind and, I would venture to say, to the minds of most Americans, such a threat is very serious. I know the American people would be very grateful if the junior Senator from California could point to any statement, published or otherwise, which provides information on this extremely serious problem.

Third, Mr. President, the security of the United States is substantially endangered when in any part of the world the Soviets succeed in so escalating the forces of conflict that our Government is tempted to hesitate before defending legitimate American interests. This principle of escalation is a vital key to the doctrine of strategic deterrents in the nuclear age. It does not really matter whether the Soviets actually want to or intend to use in actual combat—which certainly is unlikely at the moment—against the United States any of the troops or technicians which they have sent to Cuba. What does matter is that by their very presence in Cuba, American policymakers and military planers are obliged to think harder and hesitate longer before undertaking any form of action. In cold war terminology, this means the Soviets are escalating the nature of the conflict that would be required to dislodge communism from Cuba or any other place. And by that very process, they are in a large measure deterring effective American action.

Mr. President, to put this in more familiar language, the Russians have raised the ante on Cuba. We will have to raise our own ante or the Soviets will succeed in calling us out of the game. We have only to think how little force, efficiently applied, would have been necessary to dislodge Castro early in 1961, and how much more force will be required to dislodge him after the Soviets have fully established their new weapons, to understand how our security has been deeply and substantially jeopardized by the latest Soviet acts.

Fourth, Mr. President, our security has been weakened, because the United States has so shifted the meaning of the Monroe Doctrine that not only is it meaningless as a political force to be invoked against other nations, but in fact it has become a pair of handcuffs restricting U.S. action, through the imposition of what amounts to an OAS veto. Either the Monroe Doctrine means what President Monroe said it meant—that alien imperialism must not be permitted to become established in this hemisphere—or it does not mean anything. It is ridiculous to interpret the Monroe Doctrine to mean that the Communists can take over and can send huge forces into the area, so long as it is done covertly, but that we will offer no opposition, open or covert, until all nations of the hemisphere unanimously approve.

Furthermore, Mr. President, it is no service to the interests of this Nation or the hemisphere to suggest that the Monroe Doctrine does not apply where one government may invite another government in. President Monroe made it quite clear that circumstances can vary, that governments can be established, which "our southern brethren" as he put it, if left to themselves, would certainly not adopt of their own accord. In my judgment, the government of Fidel Castro is no more an established government with the support of the populace than is Walter Ulbricht's satellite regime in East Germany. Both would topple to the ground without the support of the Red army. To assert that Castro's government has any greater legitimacy or popular support than the government of East Germany is doing a disservice to the basic principle of national self-determination. I think it is clear from the language President Monroe used that he understood this. Let us not try to confuse it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). The time of the Senator has again expired.

Mr. KEATING. I ask for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I can yield the Senator only 2 minutes, unless the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] wants to yield some time to the Senator.

Mr. KEATING. I will use the 2 minutes and will make further comments later in the day.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I would like to do it, but I am almost out of time.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I have made a number of proposals in the past, including among them the complete boycott of Cuba, full OAS investigation, more effective NATO controls over the shipment of strategic goods to Cuba and over the use of NATO shipping to supply Castro, immediate end to American efforts to return vessels with military capabilities to the Castro government through the Federal courts—as was sought to be done the day before yesterday in Florida—and if no other course is successful, serious consideration of a limited blockade of all military shipments to Cuba and possibly other trouble spots within this hemisphere.

I have at no time called for an immediate landing by the U.S. Marines or an invasion of Cuba, because I believe that there are a number of other avenues which we can pursue more effectively.

But the first and foremost requirement for any sound U.S. policy is a full discussion of the facts of the situation—what is going on in Cuba right now.

It was said last evening full information had been given, but in the face of the fact that all this information had been given—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The additional time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield the Senator 3 additional minutes.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the Senator.

On August 14 I asked the State Department for official information. Yes-

terday there arrived on my desk a letter dated August 30. I must read it:

Several Soviet passenger and cargo ships arrived in Cuba during late July and early August carrying large quantities of supplies and substantial numbers of technicians of various kinds—

Nothing about 60 or 64 ships.

The Department has established that personnel landed from approximately 5 of the ships. We have no specific information about the number of persons. We have no information that any Soviet bloc troops have landed in Cuba. Although the full significance of these developments is not yet clear, there is no evidence that supplies and technicians have arrived in Cuba in such numbers as to provide support for external aggression from Cuba against other countries.

That is certainly not my idea of specific information.

It was said last evening that the background briefings had been given about the facts of this situation.

The American people are entitled to know the facts, and also where the facts come from, and also not to have them given in confidence so that they cannot be passed on to the people. Unless new data can be more validly presented than simply as reports from here or there, there is no reason whatsoever why it should be accepted by the American people as official. What is more, I find it very hard indeed to reconcile what the State Department told me in writing on August 30 as to its lack of information and evidence with all these significant briefings which we are now told had been going on for weeks, but which at the time were completely unknown to the American people.

In conclusion, Mr. President, what the American people need, first and foremost, are the full facts—the full facts about Soviet troop landings, the full facts about the potential danger to Cape Canaveral.

Again, I commend the President for making a very fine start in that direction Tuesday night.

Mr. President, to date, the American people have not had a full and frank discussion of the real issues involved in the Cuban crisis. As the letter I received from the State Department indicates, there is no desire to make those facts available except under the most intense pressure. In fact, I am well aware of the pressure which has been applied to various newsmen who have sought to discuss this matter more fully. The full facts, Mr. President, are what I am asking for today. The full facts are what the people of the United States are entitled to.

In closing, Mr. President, let me quote once again the words of the President of the United States on April 20, 1961:

Too long we have fixed our eyes on traditional military needs, on armies prepared to cross borders or missiles poised for flight. Now it should be clear that this is no longer enough—that our security may be lost without the firing of a single missile or the crossing of a single border.

I ask unanimous consent to include at the conclusion of my remarks certain comments in the press on this subject. Even though I am not in full agreement with all the points made in these

analyses, I believe both William S. White and David Lawrence have made a fine contribution to public understanding of the issues before us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
(See exhibit 3.)

EXHIBIT 1

JULY 14, 1960.

In his remarks concerning the Monroe Doctrine at his press conference on July 12, Mr. Khrushchev again displayed his extraordinary ability to ignore facts.

In the first place, the principles of the Monroe Doctrine are as valid today as they were in 1823 when the doctrine was proclaimed. Furthermore, the Monroe Doctrine's purpose of preventing any extension to this hemisphere of a despotic political system contrary to the independent status of the American States is supported by the inter-American security system through the Organization of the American States. Specifically the Organization of the American States Charter and the Rio Treaty provide the means for common action to protect the hemisphere against the interventionist and aggressive designs of international communism. Likewise, Mr. Khrushchev failed to mention that the Rio Treaty is the first of the regional treaties for which provision is made under article 51 of the United Nations Charter.

Mr. Khrushchev might appropriately reflect on the fact that one of the considerations for establishing the Rio Treaty was that: "The American regional community affirms as a manifest truth that juridical organization is a necessary prerequisite of security and peace, and that peace is founded on justice and moral order and, consequently, on the international recognition and protection of human rights and freedoms, on the indispensable well-being of the people, and on the effectiveness of democracy for the international realization of justice and security."

One of the principal purposes of the Rio Treaty was to provide a method for dealing with threats of imperialistic powers seeking to establish their domination in the Western Hemisphere.

A further remarkable development was revealed in Mr. Khrushchev's meeting with the press. Speaking as the head of the Soviet Government, he arrogated to himself the power to determine what international agreements should or should not be binding—even though the Soviet Union is not a party thereto. In this particular instance it was not only the Rio Treaty, but also the treaty between the United States and Cuba covering Guantanamo, which he has sought to abrogate. While disregard for treaties to which it is a party may be viewed by the U.S.S.R. as a convenient approach to international relations, such an effort can only be regarded by law-abiding states as another example of Soviet intervention in the affairs of other countries.

Mr. Khrushchev's latest references to United States-Cuban relations are of a piece with his threat of July 9. As a pretext for his threat, he conjured up the strawman of a nonexistent menace of U.S. aggression against Cuba.

The threat of the use of force, made so blatantly by the Soviet Chairman in relation to the affairs of nations of the Western Hemisphere, is contrary to the basic principle of the United Nations Charter which rejects the use of force in the settlement of international disputes. This naked menace by the Soviet leader, reveals the hypocrisy of his protestations in behalf of peace.

Moreover, these statements of Mr. Khrushchev appear to be designed to establish a "Bolshevik doctrine" providing for the use of Soviet military power in support of

Communist movements anywhere in the world. Mr. Khrushchev speaks approvingly of the historically positive role of the Monroe Doctrine during the 19th century, when it was applied against the European imperialisms of that day, but declares that "everything has changed abruptly" now that it stands in the way of the new imperialism: international communism.

The principles which the U.S. Government enunciated in the face of the attempts of the old imperialism to intervene in the affairs of this hemisphere are as valid today, for the attempts of the new imperialism. It consequently reaffirms with vigor the principles expressed by President Monroe: "We owe it *** to candor *** to declare that we should consider any attempt on their [European powers] part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety."

Today, nearly a century and a half later, the United States is gratified that these principles are not professed by itself alone, but represent through solemn agreements the views of the American community as a whole.

EXHIBIT 2
SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 5

Whereas intervention by the world Communist movement directly or indirectly in the affairs of any of the independent nations of the Western Hemisphere would threaten the sovereignty and political independence of that nation and other such nations; and

Whereas the free and independent nations of the Western Hemisphere have long since ceased to be objects for domination, control or colonization by other powers; and

Whereas the direct or indirect intervention by the world Communist movement by whatever means such intervention might be disguised, in any American nation, would constitute in effect such domination, control or colonization by a non-American power, and would violate the sovereignty and political independence of an American nation; and

Whereas any such intervention by the world Communist movement in the affairs of any nation situated in the Western Hemisphere would constitute a threat to the peace and safety of the United States and the other nations of that hemisphere; and

Whereas the American Republics have condemned emphatically intervention or the threat of intervention even when conditional from an extracontinental power in the affairs of the American Republics; and

Whereas the intervention of the Sino-Soviet powers in the American Republic of Cuba is threatening hemispheric unity and jeopardizing the peace and security of this hemisphere; and

Whereas in the rapidly evolving atomic age the threat presented by any such intervention might develop with such rapidity that there would not be time to assemble a meeting of the Inter-American Organ of Consultation to provide for joint action to repel the danger: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That (a) if one or more of the high contracting parties to the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance should be threatened in any manner with domination, control, or colonization through the intervention of the world Communist movement, any other such party would be justified, in the exercise of individual or collective self-defense under article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, in taking appropriate steps to forestall such intervention and any domination, control, or colonization of any nation of the Western Hemisphere by the world Communist movement.

(b) If any such defensive measures are taken by any defending nation of the Western Hemisphere, such nation should report promptly the action so taken to the Inter-American Organ of Consultation, to the end that an emergency committee, established in the manner provided by the Convention of Havana of 1940, may be organized to provide for the provisional administration of the nation so defended, pending its restoration to a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

EXHIBIT 3

THE MENACE OF COMMUNIST CUBA

(By William S. White)

The Soviet Union's publicly boasted military penetration of the Western Hemisphere in Castro Cuba is many things, apart from the most insolent menace to the New World that the United States has ever tolerated.

It destroys forever the airy assurances of pseudoliberals that "revolutionary movements" are fine things, indeed—so long as they involve leftwingers and not rightwingers.

It places a terrible responsibility before history upon all those Americans who cheered Fidel Castro on in Cuba long past the point where it was plain that he was transplanting the evil fungus of armed international communism to within 90 miles of our Florida coastline.

UNMASKS COMMUNISM

It bankrupts the whole evangelistic theory, parroted with religious fervor, that communism results from capitalistic injustice, et cetera, and will vanish at once, given the spreading of sufficient welfarism among the masses. Cuba before Castro, was never half so underprivileged as dozens of other lands which have nevertheless never sought the lethal embrace of Moscow.

It fully supports what has long been fully obvious—that communism, like Hitlerism before it, is a movement of bandit ferocity and cannot be explained by old-lady minds as simply springing from too little milk for the kiddies and too little free land for "the workers and peasants."

It brings into the gravest question the practicality of the vast effort being made by the United States through the Alliance for Progress to cure all the ills of Latin America with economic aid. Foreign aid is a sound and splendid thing—when it is given to nations willing and able to use it for freedom's strength and openly and unashamedly against communism.

But the bulk of the more powerful Latin American nations, while avidly ready for our economic aid, repeatedly have refused to follow us in any total quarantine of Castro Cuba. It is fashionable to say that we, the United States, should never "force our views" upon the recipients of our aid. This is the line even when precisely our views are essential to maintain that freedom from "foreign domination" for which the Latins so endlessly clamor—especially those who have snuggled up closest to international communism.

And brought into question, too, is the very validity of the Organization of American States. This association of the nations of this hemisphere was created to prevent just the kind of foreign penetration which is and long has been so openly involved in Castro Cuba.

But an effective majority of the OAS has thus far been unwilling to take any fully rational step against Castro Cuba. The most ironic of all excuses is given by the nation closest in geography to us, Mexico. She has said that while she would like to help, she just can't find any precedent for it in international practice. There is a sour jest in this—for Mexico, of course, is famous for its scrupulous respect for both law and justice.

COURSE FOR THE UNITED STATES

So what is now left to the United States? We should try one more time to persuade the Organization of American States to act in honesty and honor against the Soviet cancer in the Caribbean.

Failing this, we should raise a new collective military organization from among the minority who are our real friends in Latin America. Much the same was done in 1949, when we created the North Atlantic Treaty Organization from within the United Nations when it became clear that the U.N. would do nothing about Soviet aggression in Europe.

And failing this, the United States should act alone to clear the Soviet military apparatus from Castro Cuba, come what might.

KREMLIN'S NEW U-2 SMOKESCREEN

(By David Lawrence)

The Soviet Government is raising a fuss about the flight of a U-2 plane that accidentally approached a Russian island north of Japan, but the main purpose of the smokescreen of words is to bluff the United States into a policy of inaction in Central and South America.

For the Soviets see a big prize ahead. They hope to take over the countries of this hemisphere one by one, using Cuba as a military and political base from which to continue infiltration operations that will reach into every country on the North and South American continents.

More shiploads of war materials for the use of so-called technicians—who are really professional trainers of military forces—are on the way to Cuba, according to Senator KENNETH KEATING, of New York, Republican, who has just announced in a speech to the Senate that Communist-bloc military men in Cuba already number nearly 5,000. The White House says the number is approximately 3,500.

For the time being, President Kennedy chooses to regard the buildup as defensive on the part of Cuba. If it should develop into an offensive operation, the President declares the United States will take action against the flagrant violation of the Monroe Doctrine and that other Latin American countries will participate.

This warning comes because the doctrine is not only the policy of the United States but also of the Organization of American States. It bars any nation in any other hemisphere from establishing a military foothold in any country in this hemisphere. A statement approved by President Eisenhower and issued by the U.S. Department of State on July 14, 1960, said:

"In the first place, the principles of the Monroe Doctrine are as valid today as they were in 1823 when the doctrine was proclaimed. Furthermore, the Monroe Doctrine's purpose of preventing any extension to this hemisphere of a despotic political system contrary to the independent status of the American States is supported by the inter-American security system through the Organization of American States.

"Specifically the OAS Charter and the Rio Treaty (Sept. 2; 1947) provides the means for common action to protect the hemisphere against the interventionist and aggressive designs of international communism."

Later—on August 24, 1960—President Eisenhower said:

"The Monroe Doctrine has by no means been supplanted—it has been merely extended."

President Kennedy reaffirmed the position taken by preceding administrations relative to the Monroe Doctrine when, after the failure of Cuban exiles to invade Cuba in April 1961 he said:

"Let the record show that our restraint is not inexhaustible. Should it ever appear that the inter-American doctrine of non-

interference merely conceals or excuses a policy of nonaction—if the nations of this hemisphere should fail to meet their commitments against outside Communist penetration—then I want it clearly understood that this Government will not hesitate in meeting its primary obligations which are to the security of our own Nation."

Now the situation has reached a point of decision. Shall the governments of Central and South American countries be gradually infiltrated and taken over by the Soviets? The Communist apparatus and agents already have begun to infiltrate every country, from Mexico down to the tip end of South America. If the Organization of American States does nothing and if the United States is acquiescent, the Communist foothold in Latin America will be strengthened and the Monroe Doctrine will be dead for all time.

It has been suggested that, if the United States takes forceful action in Cuba, this will cause the Soviets to raise questions about Western military bases in various parts of Europe. But this, too, would be merely a smokescreen, because Moscow knows that not a single group of military advisers or technicians from the West is today based in any of the Communist bloc countries. There is no parallel, therefore, and the issue remains whether the aggression via Cuba and the Soviet threat to Central and South American countries shall be ignored or some military and economic action shall be taken to nip it in the bud now before the buildup becomes a real menace to the security of the United States.

For in Cuba—just 90 miles from Florida—the Soviets have established their military advisers "to train Cuban servicemen," as the official Moscow communiqué describes it.

In accordance with precedent and custom, Mr. Kennedy may decide to ask Congress for a joint resolution authorizing him to take whatever military steps are deemed necessary to uphold the Monroe Doctrine. Since the present session of Congress may adjourn soon, such power might well be given to the Chief Executive as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces so that he may be able to act promptly in whatever emergency may suddenly arise in Cuba or anywhere else in Latin America.

WILL CUBA BE ANOTHER "WALL OF SHAME"?

MR. PEARSON. Mr. President, during the last 6 weeks the Soviet Union made a fateful decision to supply large-scale, industrial-military aid to Cuba. This decision by the Soviets to strengthen their foothold in this hemisphere has gone unchallenged by our Government.

Statements have been made on the Senate floor that the Soviets have landed troops in Cuba. The President has responded that "we have no evidence of troops." The State Department admits that 3,000 to 5,000 Communist bloc "technicians," some of which are military specialists, have arrived in Cuba, along with military hardware. Whether these are "troops" or "technicians" is a matter of semantics. The clear fact is, the Soviet Union has reinforced its base within 90 miles of our shores with surface-to-air missiles, missile-equipped torpedo boats, trucks, munitions, radar and other electronic equipment, and the men who know how to use them. Moreover, while our attention has been focused on the recent arrival of 20 Soviet ships, the fact is that over 60 ships, many of them leased from Great Britain,

Greece, Norway, Italy, and West Germany—all NATO allies of the United States—have delivered Mig fighters, tanks, and artillery.

The present faltering and mismanaged Cuban economy and trumped-up fears of an American invasion have provided an excuse for the Soviets to furnish the Castro regime with these supplies and troops. The Soviet interest, however, is not concerned with the welfare of the Cuban people but with strengthening its base in this hemisphere; a base which will be costly for the United States to neutralize; a base from which it can export the Communist revolution to Latin and South America; a base from which it can apply leverage to offset U.S. activity in other areas of the world.

Cuba has thus become a strategically placed pawn in the cold war.

The next move is up to the President.

WHAT HAPPENED TO THE MONROE DOCTRINE?

The Monroe Doctrine was the result of an earlier attempt by Russia to push its domination into North America. It was announced by President Monroe in 1823 and has become a keystone of American foreign policy. President Monroe stated:

We owe it therefore to candor, and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those (European) powers, to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portions of this hemisphere, as dangerous to our peace and safety.

The President reaffirmed this policy on September 4, 1962, but only insofar as it applies to the use of military force by Cuba to extend communism into South America. To date the President has preferred to consider the Soviet-supplied arms as defensive weapons, but recognizing their offensive potential has warned that "the Castro regime will not be allowed to export its aggressive purposes by force or threat of force."

If the Monroe Doctrine is in fact a part of our foreign policy, then it must apply to the Cuban situation in a broader sense. It must restrict nonmilitary as well as military aggression. We have learned from costly experience that a Communist aggression utilizes devices much more subtle than outright military action and granted a militarized base in the Western Hemisphere, the Soviets will export revolution to all of the Americas.

Failure to give this full meaning to the Monroe Doctrine, in this particular case, as difficult as this might be, will make of Cuba a Western Hemisphere Berlin wall, a wall of shame, a symbol of uncertainty and indecision.

SOLUTIONS—OPPORTUNITIES LOST

Invasion, or support of invasion, of Cuba by the United States has been ruled out by the President as antagonistic to some 220 million Latin Americans and untold millions in the undecided nations of the world. Yet it is a painful paradox to recall American military intervention in South Korea, Lebanon, and the Dominican Republic, and to observe current action in South Vietnam, Laos and Thailand, while we verbally sidestep the Soviet takeover of Cuba at our very doorstep.